G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1891-92

~~192~~.

(L. R.)

File No. 208. S

Serial Nos. 1-

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-8

Part B for December 1892.

SUBJECT.

Unauthorised acquisition of lands by Deputy Amildar Mr. V. Krishna Rao and Sub Overseer Mr. Raghunatha Iyengar under the Kadaba Cutch, Gubbi Taluk.

To the Deputy Commr., Tumkur District.

No. 9102/P. F. 226-92 of 15-12-1892

Recording the Correspondence anent the acquisition of lands by Messrs. V. Krishna Rao and Raghunatha Iyengar under the Kadaba Cutch, Gubbi Taluk and intimating that needful notice have been separately

Sl. No. 8

WD 2253—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

Countermarked

Memo

On the 16th May 1887 one Ngaraihau Tau a Candidate under Sec. Native Regulations Ngaiwi Settlers at Darkhead for 15 Survey Nos. Vol. Tau formerly a portion of the Awaiti Block Land required to be Reserved for purposes of Cultivation. The Application was received by Hyamites N. Kristensen who was then in charge of the Gisborne Office. Plans were for the Sections for Survey Nos. 21, 20, 44 & 45 Vol. Book also been included in the Contract Darkhead. Plans were therefore put up for sale on the 22nd Sept 1887 by Mr. Parkinson, who had the Survey Contract

The two Darkhastdars
refused to observe
declined to bid
at the sale. Rajarathna
appealed to take them
if given out in Kandyan.
So Mr. Panchanathan Bor
gave all the 16 Nos
to him as had been
objected for by him.

A few days afterwards
on the 1st October 1889
Rajaratna relinquished
all the Nos in favor
of Ramanuja Iyengar,
the brother-in-law of
the Sub-creditor Rajanatha
Iyengar. It does not
appear that he
received any Consideration
therefor. Rajanatha Iyengar's
petition to Govt. of 15th
Sept. for Crown Grant in
Patta of all the Lands
was

was transferred to
Ramanuja Iyengar's
name for the purpose
of fixing & for the
purpose convenient
management of the
lands. When the transfer
took place Krishnaswami
was dead at Gobi, he
having left it for
Erode on the 29th Sept
About 9 months
after the said transfer,
on the 29th July 1890
Ramanuja Iyengar
presented a Registered
for all the lands
praying that they
may be transferred to
Kadambi Venkatanarasimha
Chetty, a permanent
resident of Karaikal,
who has stated that he
holds & holds after these
lands

lands for the
transfer, he having
been presented
with 5 acres for
his labour.

In Oct: 90 & Feb: 91
part of the 16 Acs were
sold for Rs 340/-.
Venkatanarasimhulu
has stated that he
effected the sales
at the request of
Ramanuja Iyengar,
& with the consent
of his brother-in-law
Thirumeniam, & paid
the sale proceeds to
the latter for transmission
to the former.

In connection with a
Complaint about
the unequal distribution
of water to the lands
under

& also upon 120 f. as being his Share of the Sale proceeds of the Estate -

The Sub-overseer was questioned about the same time by the R.M. His reply was "I have told you all I "know touching Kaylaba "Land, neither I nor "any Lands, nor have "I got any connection "with Lands held by Slaves." When the Deputy Auditor was about to produce the Correspondence, if any, on the subject. He produced five letters written to him by the Sub-overseer. Which he

in Fit Apostles in Fit 3).
They clearly show that
the Sub-owners has
withdrawn in the land
& has undertaking
to dispose of some of
them to Mr Gardiner.
On being called
upon by the Chairman
to obtain the
documentary, the
Sub-owners in his
letter of 12th Sept. 91 stated
that he had written
to Krishna Row on behalf
of his brother-in-law &
that what he meant
by "having no connection
whatever with land" by
that he had "let any
partnership with them".
Krishnarow in Ramnad
asked

asked to explain
the discrepancy
in the amount paid
to be received by
him. On the 5th Sept
he sent in a reply
(Mark Exhibit D) which
did not satisfy the file (D)
portions of which are
very obscure. The
account sent by him
is noted in the margin
of the five letters sent
by him as having been
received from the
sub-overseer no 4
a statement of accounts
without date. This
bears out the account
stated in the margin
so far as Rs 26-0-3 is
concerned. As regards
the

"Rs 35 Sent as per slip.
"Rs 30 Deduct cost for
cultivating 5 acres
at Rs 6/- per annum

"Rs 57- Balance.
"Rs 21-0-3 Ground rent of 5 acres.

"Rs 26-0-3 Total.
"Rs 120-0-0 Sale proceeds of
Kist 2 & 2 portion
of Vol. but were
promised to be
made in my name
in lieu of 5 acres.

Rs 146-0-3 Total
Rs 1-8-0 Deduct Rs. 0-2
Commission

Rs 144/2 Balance Due"

the Sale proceeds
of Nos 20 & 21 Kirkna
Mowji account
is not in accordance
with what has been
stated by Venkata-
narasimhachar who
sold the land (Exhibit
-bits) & Venkatanarasimhachari
deposition is just as
with Exh C) for Rs
150/-.

That the Defendants
& the Sub-agents
have not been
dealing at arms
length as they
should do in such
matters is apparent
from the letters
produced by them,
their explanations
above

above referred to
& their petitions
dated & sent in
Feb. each time &
prior the claim
upon the Govt.

In his petition of
16th Sept 91, Rajmoth
Sycamar the Lab-
oriers alleges that
just as he has taken
arrangements &
is carrying cultivation in
Dec 1890, at the
request of his brother-
in-law the Patadar
of the land, he
has informed by
Rajaram that the
original Darkhastdar
Trak Krishna Ror has
re-entered upon the portion
of

& that he had
been promised
5 acres of land
by him. In an
earlier portion of
the same letter he
says "it must appear
"that the Dyakendar
"Sir Krishnaswa, then
"in charge of Salem
"Taluq, desired
"through the Shanbhag
"Mr. Kalappa to
"have a part of
"those lands for
"some one on his
"side. Sir Rayaruthar
"promised him any
"five acres." The
Dyakendar on the
contrary says that
it was the Sub-amuse
himself

Lunacy that first
differed the land
claim between the
22d & 29th Sept: 1869
on the eve of
his giving over
charge of the Gabori
Valley. (Vide his own
Book Jubilum 10th
Sept 71 & Govt: &
his reply 18th May 71
& Gazette). The
error of the first
documents produced
by Kristnaiyer also
misled Rob the
Sub-overseer who
came not with the
whole truth.

Although Kristnaiyer
did not give in accurate

&

to have the portion
of 5 acres of land
transferred to his
name, like the 2
November 1830 while
his letter of that date
to the Sub-overseer
in Zilla A) yet
that he has contemplating
5 acres of
Rice land under
Kotaka Tank from
a much earlier time,
is evident from the
opening lines of
the Sub-overseers
letter Dr. 7 of 2/8/37
which is as follows. "But
"of the land under
"Kotaka Tank
"for required about
"5 acres & the same
"has been promised
"I request of Your

18

"if you would require
"the same to be
"transferred to the
"name of any one
"in your stead, or
"desire it to be retained
"as at present" this in
Ross's explanation of
this significant passage
passage in the earliest
letter for Browning is
as follows. "I then
"understood & even
"now understand it to
"mean that he would
"intended to give me
"5 acres, & to cultivate
"the same along
"with his own lands
"& not before doing
"so he wished to ascertain
"from me whether I
"would like to have
the

"the 5 acres described
"or No. x x x with
"reference to the
"Claim whether it
"shd be retained
"as at present" it seems
"to me that he contemplated
"that the relation
"wh. existed between
"the other land shd
"exist between those
"lands also; that is
"I understand him
"mean that they
"shd be under
"his management".

Again, the Sub-
Overseer Statement
of accounts without
date already referred
to shows that one
the Sub-overseer &
the Gentlemen present

have or believed
to have been the
joint proprietors
of the lands in
question.

From all this
the Jurisdiction doth
presume that all the
earlier transfers,
of the lands, above
referred to were
not bona-fide
ones, but were
merely colorable
transactions, & that
both the Defendant
Krishna Row & the
Sub-Assessor Rajamanikam
Ayyapar jointly acquired
lands under the
Kadaba Tank & thereby

a Warrant Clearing
& Forwarding Agents
in as much as
they Managed to
get them for
Nothing & Shortly
afterwards Sold
part of 16 Lots
for a Profit of
Rs 340/-

Under Rule Excep
the Land Rev. Code
Dy Auctions are
prohibited from
acquiring Lands
in their Own Colleys
without the previous
Sanction of the
Govt. This not
by Plaintiff is Not
he acquired his

Page 11

his interest in the
lands under Kotoba
tank which he has
in Nos Galtri Lodge.

The Board
recommends that
a fine of Rs 240/-
twice the amount
realized by him
in the transaction
may be imposed
in Krishnaji's case,
~~in addition to~~
considering that
he merely admitted
the fact instead
of denying them
like the Sub-overseer
whom Col. Bowen
has strictly refused

Ref. to Mr. in the
R.N. Department.

Kindly see how
the matter at
Kantara. Further
Regimental Reports
to be suspended
since Sept. last.

Sd. 25/3/92

(General Serial No. 30).

189

From Deputy Commissioner Tumkur District.

To Chief Secretary to the Government of Mysore.

Dated Tumkur 1st July 1891.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 1

General No.

No. 168

I have the honor to submit herewith for information copy of a Memo on the subject of the acquirement of some land by Deputy Tahsildar Krishna Row.

I am Sir Your obedient servant Deputy Commissioner

Tumkur

This is a very bad Case agt the Dep. Tahsildar & worse agt the Shist Sheristadar - Enquiry should be done abt the latter. I don't quite understand the Case. I presume the Dep. Tahsildar accepted a Darkast from a Benami Darkastdar for waste Govt land, instead of selling the same under my rules of - . . . . . when was this done before or after the Rules? ~~Why was not the Head Sheristadar under the Rules~~ Now after the Rules the Case simply amounts to this - the Tahsildar & Sheristadar joined to defraud the Govt of its just due from a Sale, & thus transferred to them are pocketed the Sale proceeds of the land, which shd go into the public Exr

131
4-7-91

Call for dates of the
various proceedings in
connection with the land
for the beginning, with a
note showing the land taken
up & Ramanujacharlu, whether vacant or occupied,
extent, assessment; when taken up, when
sold, to whom by whom - for what
amount - what is the arithmetic of Rs 120
which the Dy ~~Comm~~ annulled says
he received. What letters he has
for the Sub Register - &c.

I want the report very early - as the
Case has a hard look about it

17/7/91

Memorandum. 1/a

In connection with the complaint about the unequal distribution of water to the land under the Kahuku Ditch on the South side it was stated in an endeavour to show that Mr Knudsen, Deputy Sheriff, had in charge of the said Ditch and in enjoining said Parties not to draw Waiahuna Spring, acquired some land under the said Ditch, the first Surveyor having been got made out in the name of Kamauoha the brother-in-law of the said Tax Assessor.

2. Upon the the Deputy Sheriff was requested to state upon oath the above allegations was true. He replied he did not, that when he was in charge of the said South Ditch, the said Tax Assessor asked him if he could take some of land near the said Ditch, that at the thought that the land should improve by reason of water he left and that after he left again and went to Waiahuna the Tax Assessor went to him that the land was about to be bought under the plough and asked him,

him, if he asked to explain any portion of it, that he accepted said last 35 pages on account of the ignorance of Civilization, that after a time the Lac Arrace sent him back 25 pages as being the balance that remained after deducting the expenses incurred on account of Civilization as also 20 pages as being the share of the said proceeds of the land.—

3. As per clause 4 of Section II of the Terms Act, it was necessary for Mr Trudeau to obtain the previous sanction of the Department for the acquirement of the land in the said in which he was employed. Mr Trudeau explained on the point that although the Department commanded, while he was in charge of the Settlement, all the actual acquirement took place after he left the Settlement and that because he did not obtain the previous sanction of the Minister Commissioner of the Land Department of the said Clause 4, he was dismissed, since in the position that he was, it was necessary to comply with the formalities of the Land Act. But he did not do it, and his explanation on this point is that he did not know that the nine Accumulated

Accumulated

amounted to actual requirements of land.

4. Mr Kreiner's explanations to me at the time seemed to me, to the best of my unintelligent knowledge, that he should not have at any expected proposal of the Surveyor as long as he paid, but that he should have to require the land not in his name but in the name of a 3rd party and subsequently deeded it to the sale proceeds and mortgage deed that he did not want but that circumstances amounted to actual requirement of land and therefore omitted to report the same, as he may would not quite unacceptable. It is hoped that he will not attempt to do the like again.

5. The particulars relating to accompanying petition regarding the requirement of the land in question were stated in a letter to the Executive Engineer with a request that the Sub Collector might be asked to state if no objections were there. In reply the Sub Collector sent all knowledge of the matter. His reply is quite satisfactory with not that before mentioned and seems even more clear than the requisition of the land. It is, however, a matter for regret in the Public that requirement. Accordingly a Copy of this paper and a copy of the Executive Engineer's letter on this subject will be submitted to the Secretary to the Govt

Government of Ireland as the British Treasury Department.

6. A copy of this will also be submitted to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Ireland.

Sgd. H. A. Robertson

Deputy Commissioner.

/Copy/

Sgd. Alexander Montgomery

Deputy Commissioner.

H.A.R.

(2)

To,

The Deputy Commissioner
Trichur District

Lr. 1556/83

D. 22/23 July 1871.

His Docket No. 108 dated 1st instant, submitting copy of a memo in re the illegal acquirement of certain lands under the Kadalai Tank in the Ayyur Talik, by Krishna Row, Deputy Amildar, while in charge of the said Talik, in conjunction with the Sub Cheruvar Raghunatha Iyen, and getting the patta in the name of the Sub Cheruvar's brother-in-law Ramanujam

It is not apparent from the Deputy Commissioner's memo, whether the Deputy Amildar accepted a document from a Brahmin

Binami Pattahastdar for waste Government Land, instead of letting the same under the Rules of July 1904 before the introduction of the Rules in question, as after it. The Deputy Comm^r will report the dates of the various proceedings in connection with the Land from the beginning, with a map showing the entire Land taken up by Ramanjiappa, whether waste or unoccupied, extent, assessment, when taken up, when sold, to whom and by whom and for what amount - What is the antecedents of R. 120 which the Deputy-Tahsildar admits

(General Serial No. 30).

1891.

From

3

To The Deputy Commr.
Tumkur Dist.

Dated 10th August 1891.

Despatched 12th

Received

Enclosures No. (1)

General No. 5688.

No. 97.

Forwards for information, Copy of letter No. 3445 dated 5th instant, from the Chief Engineer in Mysore reporting the suspension of Sub Overseer Kaliyanatha Iyengar, pending further investigation of the charge against him.

2. The report called for in para 3 of Govt Proc. R.V. No. 4886/83

9

D.

d 22d ultimo, is enclosed.

R.Q.

Chas Lee

enclosed
6/8.

(General Serial No. 30).

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
21 AUG. 91

4880
242

18[illegible]

From The Deputy Commissioner
Tumkúr District

(4)

To The Chief Secretary
to the Government of
Mysore

Dated Tumkúr, 18th August
1891.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 3

(5)

General No.

No. 320.

Government order c/o: 4586/83
of the 22nd ultimo and the
Chief Secretary's docket c/o:
5088 of the 10th instant re-
-ceipt the ~~acquisition~~ requisition of
lands by Deputy Tahsildar
Mr: Krishna Rau and
Sheristadar Raghunatha-
Iyengar under the Kada-
-va Tank in the Tumbi Tank

Has the honor to state
that the record shows
that one Raghavachar
applied for the lands
in question particulars
whereof

132
22-8-91

whereof are noted in

No:	Extent	Assessment
20	2—3	8—"—"
21. X	2—3	8—"—"
26. X	2—15	8—"—"
27.	2—20	8—8—.
28.	1—35	6—8—"
29	1—38	6—8—"
30	2—5	7—"—"
31.	1—11	4—8—"
32	2—3	7—"—"
33.	1—37	6—8—"
35.	2—3	7—"—"
36.	1—26	6—"—"
37.	2—5	7—8—"
40.	2—"	6—8—"
44. X	2—"	6—8—.
45.	1—32	6—"—"
Total 16	31—36	110—"—"

the margin)
in the 16th
August
1889. Mr:
Krishna
Row was
then in
charge of
the Taluk
and
received
the Darkast.

The Applic=
=ant Raghavachar was
(it is alleged) then a Contrac=
=tor under Sub Overseer Ragha=
=thadyengar. These Lands
were formerly a portion
of the Communal Kha=
=dal, resigned to the Revenue
department for purpose
of cultivation. They were
therefore not in holding.
They were surveyed and
classed by the Survey
department after resigna=
=tion by the Communal
department

being in his name. When this transfer was objected, Mr: Krishna Row was not in charge of the taluk, but Mr: Kanteravachar, the former having left Gubbi for Tumkur on the 2nd of October 1889.

3. Nine months later or, that is on the 29th of July 1890, the lands were again transferred by brotherin-law Ramanuja-Iyengar to one Kadambi Venkata Narasimhachar, a permanent resident of Kadaba, who (it is locally stated) is acting for the Subsuperior as his agent. And in partial corroboration of this belief Venkata-Narasimhachar has given a statement that he holds and looks after these lands for Ramanuja-Iyengar (the brotherinlaw) he having been given 5 acres for his labor.

It

It is further clearly stated that the transfer was effected last — in Ramanujayengar's close relationship with the Overseer might be taken to be a link connecting the Overseer with the land.

4. Subsequently, of these numbers as per margin were sold to different individuals for 340 rupees, the Patta-dar Kadam-bi Venkata-narasim-hachar (described above as agent) — stating in his deposi-tion that he effected the

No:	Subdt.	Assessment.	Purchase Survey	Purchaser
23.	2—3	8—"—"	75—"—"	Patta
24.	2—3	8—"—"	75—"—"	Vatekana
35.	2—3	7—"—"	50—"—"	K. Ramanujayyer
37.	2—5	7—8—"	50—"—"	Venkatram Shetti
40.	2—"	6—8—"	50—"—"	"
44	2—"	6—8—"	90—"—"	Subbaramayya Sastry.
45	1—32	6—"—"	90—"—"	
		Total	340—"—"	

Deputy Amildar and
of them as were sent by
the latter, were forwarded
to him. Copies thereof
are herein enclosed. A
perusal of these copies
shews that there must have
been some more correspond-
ence. So, Mr: Krishna Rao
was requested to send
them, but he says that
he has not got them.

8. Copy of letter No: 199
of the 8th instant and
directed to the Chief Engi-
neer on this subject is
enclosed.

9. From what has transp-
pired it seems to be clear
that Deputy Amildar
Mr: Krishna Rao and
Suboverseer Raghoonath
Iyengar both jointly
acquired lands under
the Kadaia tank appa-
rently clandestinely
and

and presumably unjus-
-tly inasmuchas they
managed to get them
without any consideration
despite the several appli-
-cations for some of them.
The fact that shortly
afterwards the Landlord
fetched good prices shows
that they were valuable
fields.

10. But as Mr: Krishna-
-Row, readily admitted
the facts instead of de-
-nying them like the
Subdivisional Officer, the under-
-signed ventures to recom-
-mend his Case for the
most merciful considera-
-tion of Government inas-
-muchas he is a young
Officer of intelligence
and promise, and this seems
to be his first act of in-
-discretion. Probably a
fine equal to twice the
amount (Rs 20 Rupees) realized
by

by him in the foregoing
transaction may meet
the case.

Witness my hand this 19th day of

Deputy Commissioner
Tenkás District

No. 109 Encl.

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Tumkur District
Tumkur 8th August 89.

(4/6)

To
The Chief Engineer
of Mysore

Sir,

In continuation of this Office docket no. 89 of the 2nd instant forwarding certain documents about Sub Overseer Raghunath Iyengar having acquired some lands under the Kadaba Tank in the Gubbi Taluk, I have the honor to forward for your information and obliging return the rough account of Collection of revenue arrears kept by the Patel of the village from which it will be seen that on the 20th of February 89, the Sub Overseer himself paid a Kandayam of Rs. 70. The portion has been marked in red ink and initialled by me.

2 Enquiry shows that in the Year 88-89 three Lands were obtained in the name of one Raghavachar who it is alleged was then a Contractor under the Sub Overseer, that shortly afterwards in the same year the said

was transferred to the name of Ramanuja Iyengar, the Sub Collector in charge, and in the year 1922 the patta was again transferred to the name of one Kadambi Venkatavaradachariar who it is said to be acting for the Sub Collector and that in the same year several trees were sold to several persons for 340 Rs the sale deeds having been signed by the Sub Collector.

3. It is alleged that soon after the lands were acquired the channel necessary for irrigating them was either excavated or repaired by the Sub Collector. Copies of correspondence already forwarded will show that enquiry was made through the Executive Engineer to know when and at whose instance the work was undertaken.

You are in possession of the reply that I got to the enquiry. You may perhaps be able to obtain more detailed information.

4. I may perhaps mention that I am given to understand that during the Sub Collector's action in the matter of using water to trees and certain persons complained to the Executive Engineer of the assignments of lands by the Sub Collector and that that officer made certain enquiry thereon. Further allegations were made about what transpired at the enquiry but as there may be record of such enquiry this probably necessary to report upon the verbal statements made to me.

I have the honor to be
Your most obedient servant
C. R. Venkatavaradachariar
Dy. Commr.

"Copy"
Dy. Commr.

This record is not found

(4/a)

Copy of the Correspondence carried on between Mr. V. Krishna Rao and Mr. Raghunatha Iengar.

No 1.

Dated 10/12/89
Kadaba

Dear Sir

Out of the Kaval lands under Kadaba Tank you required about 5 acres and the same has been promised. I request to know if you would require the same to be transferred to the name of any one in your favour, or desire it to be retained as at present. The cost which I incurred for cultivation of these lands as estimated will come to Rs 1-8- a per acre. Besides I cannot personally supervise the works necessary for cultivation and water supply &c. I want to appoint a man for the purpose on Rs 5 or 6 per month for about 2 or 3 months. I want to know of your opinion about it. However we by our best to cultivate all the lands by taking water in the Channel up to the end. But it remains to be seen whether present water in the tank would last till the crop is finally cut or not. If it does not rain in June or July next in my opinion I am not quite certain of getting the crops.
I request for your kind reply regarding the approval of my above arrangements

Yours very sincerely
(Signed) V. Raghunathiengar

Letter No. 2

Dated 9/9/90
Kadaba

Dear Sir

I wrote to you two letters, I did not get a reply to neither of them as yet. Out of the 10 acres of land that were cultivated, some of the crops have become ripened and are to be cut. The crops on two acres are cut and heaped. The thrashing is delayed for want of supervision. I cannot stay at Head Quarters. I shall have to depend upon others. The crops on 3 or 4 acres are still under growth. Please reply me to my letters of previous dates. Do you intend to keep up the 5 acres. If so please send a man on your side to look after or dispose them off at your desire. In case you do not like to keep up the lands, there is a demand for it at Rs7 per acre, please write to me if I can dispose it off so. One sixth of the produce now on the land of nearly 10 acres will be your profit. The cultivation is not well attended to by ryots and the crops are not good. In case you do not like either the land or its produce and desire to leave the connection with it I shall send you your money (35-0-0) back together with a profit of Rs 15-0-0 ie in total Rs 50-0-0. Please write to me soon as to the opinions you adhere to.

I beg to remain
Sir

Your most Sincerely
(Signed) V. Raghunatha Kiengar

Letter No. 3.

Dated 29/10/'90
Kadaba

(a Postcard)

I received your letter of the 2nd Instant yesterday. As I have to attend Quill halli for measurements &c being the end of the month I am not able to meet you as desired. I have to shift my head quarters to Mangsandra hereafter as ordered by my officer. I have explained fully all the circumstances in connection with P. F in all my three letters. I received up to date from P. F 7½ cdies more than can be expected. Please let me know of your decisive opinion about it. The Statement of accounts in connection will follow. No more particulars. I am doing well and hope that this will meet you in Sound health

Yours obediently

(Sd) V. R

Account of receipts and disbursements
for Arlimadoo lands.

Disbursements

Land Revenue including notice fee	117-14-0
Paid for cutting grass or hothay	25-0-0
Do — Do —	7-8-0
Clearing silt in channels —	24-8-0
Paddy bought and supplied for seed	11-0-0
Paid in money for cane	7-0-0
Total Expenditure	192-14-0

for 32 acres.
Average cost per acre is Rs 6-0-0
Total for 5 acres ——— 30-0-0

Receipts

Total receipts of paddy is 12 candies and 2 kolagas after deducting all the expenditures such as mirasse cart hire etc. Out of the above, 6 candies were of small grain and 6 were of big including seed paddy.

big grains { For 4½ candies @ 9-8-0 = Rs 42-12-0
Do ½ do since sold at 10-8-0 = 15-12-0

Small grains { 6 candies sold at 11-8-0 = 69-0-0

Received in money back 7-0-0

Total receipts in money 134-8-0

Total receipt for 32 acres = Rs 134-8-0

Average receipt per acre = 4-3-3
for 5 acres = Rs 21-0-3

(Continued)

Extra Amount received for 5 acres — 5-0-0

Total due Rs 26-0-3.

Receipt for selling lands inconvenient for water &c and remain at tail end of Channel

S.No.	acres	Amount
40	2	5-0-0
44	2	99-0-0
45	1-32	
35	2-3	48-0-0
37	2-5	
5		Total 197-0-0

Land grassy & uncultivable 10-0-0

Average per Acre Rs 6-2-6.

for 5 acres Rs 30-12-6.

Total Amount due from me to you will be Rs 56-12-9 (26-0-3 + 30-12-6)

The remaining ho of acres is 21-32 Kuntas

Your portion will be ½ of the above or 3 acres 26 Kuntas

(Sd) V. Raghunatthingam

No 5 Copy of the coupon of the money Order sent on 2/2/91.

Sir.

I have herewith sent you Rs

the amount due to you as per my accompanying letter. Please address acknowledgement to Kadaba only.

Yours.

(Sd.) Raghunatha

N.B. Mr. Krishnarao has noted down upon this Cheque in Canarese 24/8/as owing to

Copies
Deputy Treasurer
Deputy Treasurer
J. Hunter

(General Serial No. 30).

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
5117
28 AUG.
259

189/.

From The Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District

To The Chief Secretary
to the Government
of Mysore

Dated Camp Hebbur 25th August 18

Despatched 29th

Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 341
No.

This office Docket No. A-966 320 of the 18th instant about the acquisition of lands by Deputy Amildar Mr. Krishnarow and Sub-Overseer Raghavendrachariyar under the Kadaba tank in the Gubbi Taluk.

Have the honor to state that this morning Mr. Panchanattiah Row told the undersigned that the fields in question were

not put up to auction in
one lot, but each separate
-ly=

[illegible]

Deputy Commissioner
Yukon District

(General Serial No. 32.)

189/92

No. 140

Name of Petitioner. V. Krishna [illegible]

Village. —

Taluk. Kottapeta [illegible]

District. Tanjore

Date of Arzi. 1st Sept. 91

Date of Receipt. 19.7.92

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. One

ABSTRACT.

Submits a memorial [illegible]
to be allowed [illegible]
[illegible]
Kavala Tank, [illegible]

OFFICE OF THE
19 SEP. 91

(6)

No. 1421 Regd

To The Chief Secretary to the Government Bombay

Respected Sir

With due deference and humble submission I beg to submit a memo of my explanation in re the illegal acquirement of lands under the data I will in the Gulbidal brought to the notice of Government by the Deputy Commissioner in his docket No 320 dated 18 August 1891, and to pray that my case may kindly considered and justice combined with mercy shown to me.

I beg to remain
Respected Sir
Your most obedient & humble servant
V. Krishnamachar
Deputy Amildar
Hubli

10 September 1891

Memo of explanations furnished
by V. Krishnarao, Deputy Amildar
of Korlagere in the Tumkur District
re. Illegal acquirement of lands
under Kadaba Tanti in the Civil Court

The chief points
referred to in the Deputy
Commissioner's report
No 320 of 18th ultimo
to the Chief Secretary
to the Government
on the subject involve
into the following.
1 whether the lands
had any saleable
value at the time of
settlement and whether
the acquisition was
clandestine &
2 whether the same
was unauthorized

There

There is nothing on record to prove the first point. It may be seen from the words that the lands in question were such as to call for no bids at the time of the sale by the Settlement Officer, V. Panchanatha Rao, on 22nd September 1889. There are several collateral circumstances supporting the Conclusion and some of them are named below -

1 The revolutions of the lands to the Tank and to the sluices.

2. The incomplete construction of the channels and the uncertainty of water supply.

3 The barrenness of the soil for many years as

a feature for Annual
Rental Cattle ?

4 The absence of applica-
tions for other lands
in waste subsequent
to settlement.

2. The presentation of
5 applications for
lands including some
of those applied for by
Ranghava Chár before
the settlement, the
absence of bids due
to the lands having
been sold in one lot,
and not individually,
and the subsequent
sales between private
persons (not shortly
afterwards as alleged
in the report, but after
one harvest - a year)
are urged in the report
in favor of the theory
that these lands had
originally

originally saleable
values - The mere
presentation of applica
-tions for a very few
lands not followed
by bids at sales, though
sold individually,
as subsequently ascer
-tained from Mr. Panch
-nathaRao and reported;
so as to place the
lands within the
reach of one and all
and to profit the
Government in the
shape of sale proceeds,
is an act especially
in cases like the one
under reference,
indicating their inability
or want of resources
on the one hand,
and the unproductive
character of the lands
on the other hand.

The

in 4 cases out of 29
upto date there have
been sales - These it
maybe stated, were
not sales of lands,
but were really the
upset prices fixed on
trees standing on them.
Hence the lands upto
date have not acquired
value of their own
not even by influx of
time. The grant of
lands to other than
Raghava Chari by the
Settlement Officer at
the rate of Jumabandi
or mere Kaul agam
(without consideration
in the words of the Deputy
Commissioner) and the
subsequent grants
by Amildars that
succeeded Krishnaswa
to the charge of the Gubbi
Taluk

Taluk clearly remove
all distinctions in
regard to the nature,
quality &c of lands, &c
&c appertaining to the
Kaval, so prominently
hoped against the
16 numbers granted
to Raghava Char, who
is a resident Land-
holder under the Taluk
and with which [illegible]
the officials under reference
have been connected.
Another point worth
a mention in this
connection is that of
the subsequent sale of
only 7 out of 16 numbers
between private persons
which show that these
lands were only capable
of acquiring value after
improvement, and
the average price per
acre of the 7 numbers
sold

3/

Cost being only 2½ d.
including Cost &c.
These facts it may
be stated, are sufficient
to show that the land
already granted & those
that are still kept
waste were valueless
in themselves and any
expectation in the shape
of a decent price was
impossible.
4. Regarding the second
point, the Deputy
Amildar was only
in the temporary charge
of the Gubbi Taluk till
2nd September 1859. He
was permanently appointed
as Deputy Amildar
on 12th August of that
year, but was detained
by the order of the then
Deputy Commissioner
in charge of the Taluk

until he was relieved
by Kaunhiava Chief on
29th September 1889. On
16 August the application
for the 6 lands in question
was received by him
and on which date
he received a letter
from Mr C. Brys, the
then Deputy Commissioner
intimating his (Deputy
Amildar's) non-confirm
ation in his post as
Amildar. The settle
ment of the Kaval lands
was then pending and
therefore the 5 applications
received by him for
these and other lands
were kept for disposal
by the Settlement Officer.
The settlement took
place on the 22nd September
and the Deputy Amildar
left the Taluk on 29 idem,
i.e. within a week
He

41

the lands if left in
the hands of local agt.
for cultivation till & after
without an agent of
his own to look after them.
He sent Rs 120/- a, the
sale proceeds of these
two numbers. These
facts the Deputy Auditor
readily admitted
when he was first
asked by the Deputy
Commissioner, and
never made a secret
of it, as his intention
from the time of his
acceptance of Nadiyan
was to secure the lands
(5 acres) for himself-
as family property,
and to have all the
formalities & make it
an unquestionable thing.
But the transfer of
these two numbers
which

which he hoped could
to take place was not
effected owing to causes
stated above; which
he never anticipated;
and his connection
ceased on and with
the sale of lands for
Rs 120/- He feels surprised
to find that these
two numbers were sold
for Rs 150/- and why a
less sum of Rs 120/- was
remitted therein by the
Sub overseer he cannot
account as he is
ignorant of events that
were not brought to
his notice by the Sub Division
He believed that an
obligation to submit
a statement of lands
acquired would begin
when the lands capable
of being specified were
so done and taken
possession

profession of, but in the
case under reference
as the transfer did
not take place but
the sale was effected
a month after the
lands were partitioned
by numbers 20 & 21, he
considered that the
subscription of the state-
ment was uncalled for.
He relied upon the
sub-overseer regarding
the details of the
transaction as he was
indebted to him for the
business which arose
after the mill was enlarged,
continued for more
than a year and termina-
ted in a sale. In all
these transactions
he looked to the sub-overseer
as his agent, and he
made up his mind
to

to accept the office when
at Hubejar by an encouraging
account he had heard
of the lands from the
Sub-overseer in the matter
of their cultivation, water
supply &c, but the idea
died with the departure
of the Sub-Overseer from
the place and the apathy
shown by the ryots towards
the cultivation - It may
be gathered that the
Deputy Amildar was
not a party to the bargain
while he was in charge
of Gubbi Taluk, and
never used his official
influence to the detriment
of any one's interest.
The first application
which was presented
by Raghavachar on 16th
August 1889 was not
accepted by the Deputy
Amildar

but was kept for the general
by the settlement officer
as already alluded to.
There was then no idea
or talk in the matter
of interest to be created
in the Deputy Amildar.
This idea was first
communicated by the
Sub Overseer to the
Deputy Amildar after
the Settlement and
before his departure
from the place i.e. between
22nd & 29th September 1887.
further when the application
for was presented to
the Deputy Amildar.
was aware of this appoint-
ment to his present
post of Deputy Amildar,
and was ready to leave
the Taluk before the
Survey Settlement was
conducted by the General

Afterwards commissioners
but was put off a week
owing to Kentrias's
delay in joining his
new place - In either
case he was one whose
connection with the
Talbot was known
to have been at an end.
He never knew the
connections between
the several persons
named in the report
as having received
and paged lands,
and the Sub overseer,
and the interest which
the latter had in the
transactions, beyond
what he had learnt
from his letters - As
the productive character
of these lands and of
turning them into a
profitable bargain was
doubtful the Sub overseer

offered 5 acres to the
Deputy Amildar as
his partner in the event
that he may share in
his loss should they
occur in the cultivation
of these lands, especially
as he was leaving the
Taluk and that his
connection with it
severed. The Deputy
Amildar remitted
Rs. 35/- on account of the
expenses &c and the sum
when compared to 5 acres
was not small.
5 From the enquiries
made on the spot by
the Deputy Commissioner,
by the Amildar, vide his
report No. 523 dt/14th August 189
and lastly by the Sheristadar
the Deputy Amildar's
name has been nowhere
mentioned in connection
with any transaction
by

by any party; nor the records do so - He regrets very much for the unfortunate mention of his name seriously with the disposal by Government of by others of these lands -

6 From the above facts it may be gathered that the Deputy Surveyor's actions were neither fraudulent nor clandestine nor those indicating a wilful violation of rules, but were innocent and honest. He prays that if there was an omission on his part to report his connection with the lands which at this juncture he may be pardoned for the inadvertance.

6/

He is a faithful Servant of nearly 20 years standing and has been always faithful and attentive in the discharge of his duties -

Krishna Rao
Deputy Amildar
10th Sept 1879 Kortagere Sub-Taluk

(General Serial No. 30).

391
Surveillera

1891. 15-12-91.

From The Deputy Commissr
Kunkur Distrt

To The Chief Secretary
to the Government
of Mysore

Dated 14th December 1891.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 1 file.

General No.
No. 571.

Sir—

With reference to
your Telegram of the
9th instant, I beg to
forward herewith as
per Margin, the Vernacular
Correspondence in the
matter of aggression
of Canoday Deputy
Amildar Krishnarow
and Sub overseer
Raghavendra Iyengar
under the Kadaba Taluk
of the Gubbi Taluq.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

Deputy Commissr

Attended to 15/12

Draft
JWR
21/12/92

28

Read:

Correspondence ending with
Govt No. 371 dated 2 December
1892, from Rao Bahadur
Sundara Pt. inviting Re
Vernacular Enrolment
Amend Re requisition of
Land by Dy. Inspr. V. Krishna
Rao, and Sub-Asst Engineer Raghunatha-
Iyengar and Re Kasab Tank
Gubbi Taluq.

Order Recon:- No 9102
Tech 226-92
Dt 15th Dec. 1892.
23

Recorded.

The Govt. have taken neutral
Position in this case separately —

21/12

Chief Secy.

91

To
Dy. Comm. Tumkur
Dt. returning Rec'd papers.

Section Dt. nil.
SKR.
21/12/92.

7

(General Serial No. 30.)

189

From

To

Dated 15
Despatched 23. } 92
Received

Enclosures No. with one file.

General No. 9102
P. F. No. 226 — 92